

*Comiskey et al.*  
*Serial No. 09/683,179*  
*Amendment After Final Rejection*  
*Page 7*

## REMARKS

Claim 1 has been further amended to incorporate therein the subject matter of claim 9, thus specifying that the display comprises light valves disposed between the light sources and the photoconductor and arranged to control transmission of light from the light sources to the photoconductor. Basis for this amendment is found in former claim 9. Consequently, claim 9 has been cancelled and claims 10-12 and 14 amended to depend from claim 1 rather than the cancelled claim 9. Claims 22 and 31 have been amended in a manner exactly parallel to claim 1; basis for these amendments exists in former claim 32, which has now been cancelled, with consequential changes in the dependencies of claims 33, 36 and 37.

No new matter is introduced by any of the foregoing amendments.

The 35 USC 102(b) rejection of claims 31-37 as anticipated by Markin et al., U.S. Patent No. 3,700,802 is traversed. More specifically, this rejection is traversed on the grounds that Markin does not describe an electronic display having light valves disposed between light sources and a photoconductor and arranged to control transmission of light from the light sources to the photoconductor, as now required by all the present claims.

The applicants concede that Markin teaches an electronic display having a photoconductor, and a plurality of light sources associated with the photoconductor, with each light source defining at least one row of pixels. However, applicants specifically take issue with the Examiner's statement, in the first paragraph on Page 3 of the Office Action, that, with regard to (former) claim 32, Markin teaches light valves (light pipe 58) disposed between the light source (70) and the photoconductor (49) and arranged to control transmission of light from the light sources (70) to the photoconductor (49). It is respectfully submitted that this statement is untenable for two reasons, namely (a) a light pipe is not a light valve and does not control the transmission of light as required by the present claims; and (b) the light pipes (58 etc.) are part of the light sources, not light valves.

*Comiskey et al.*  
*Serial No. 09/683,179*  
*Amendment After Final Rejection*  
*Page 8*

With regard to point (b), attention is directed to the fact that the present claims require that the claimed electronic displays comprise light sources arranged as a series of elongate rows, *each elongate row defining at least one row of pixels of the display* (emphasis added). The sources 70 in Markin are not elongate and do not define rows of pixels of the display; it is only the combination of the sources 70 and the light pipes 58 which can possibly be regarded as providing elongate light sources defining rows of pixels. Accordingly, the light pipes must be regarded as part of the light sources defining rows of pixels. When the light pipes are correctly seen as part of the light sources themselves, there is nothing in Markin which corresponds to the light valves required by the present claims.

With regard to point (a), the light pipes 58 etc. in Markin are simply passive transmitters of the light from the associated sources and do not control the transmission of light.

The 35 USC 103 rejection of claims 1, 9-12, 17-18 and 20 as unpatentable over Jacobson in view of Markin, and the 35 USC 103 rejection of claim 15 as unpatentable over Jacobson in view of Markin and Drzaic, are traversed for the same reasons as the 35 USC 102 discussed above. Neither Jacobson nor Drzaic does any thing the remedy the deficiencies in Markin already mentioned.

For all the foregoing reasons, the 35 USC 102 and 103 rejections are unjustified and should be withdrawn.

Reconsideration and allowance of all claims now present is respectfully requested.

No additional claim fees are required in connection with this Amendment.

Entry of this Amendment After Final Rejection is respectfully solicited on the grounds that it will not require extensive consideration by the Examiner, being confined to the limitation of claim 1 to the same scope as former claim 9, limitation of claim 31 to the same scope as former claim 32 and a parallel amendment in claim 22, with a brief explanation of the differences between the present invention and the

*Comiskey et al.*  
*Serial No. 09/683,179*  
*Amendment After Final Rejection*  
*Page 9*

references, but will place all claims in order for allowance. It is respectfully noted that the applicants have had no previous opportunity to comment on Markin.

Since the normal period for responding to the Office Action expired April 25, there is filed herewith a Petition for a one month extension of this period

Respectfully submitted



David J. Cole  
Registration No. 29629

E INK Corporation  
733 Concord Avenue  
Cambridge MA 02138

Telephone (617) 499-6069  
Facsimile (617) 499-6200  
E-mail dcole@eink.com